

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-13, 16-19, 29-35, and 37-42, all the claims pending in the application, stand rejected on prior art grounds. Claims 1-3, 6-9, 29, 31, 33-35, and 37-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 1 and 33 are amended. No new matter is added. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion. The following paragraphs have been numbered for ease of future reference.

I. The 35 U.S.C. §101 Rejection

[0001] Claims 1-3, 6-9, 29, 31, 33-35, and 37-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. These rejections are traversed as explained below.

[0002] Applicants submit that claim 1 recites “a computer-implemented method of analyzing opinions in a text document, said method comprising: using a computer, establishing...” Thus, claims 1 and 33 define statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

II. The Prior Art Rejections

[0003] Claims 1, 10, 33, and 41-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Privault, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0128122), hereinafter referred to as Privault. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

[0004] Privault describes multiword expressions are mapped to identifiers using finite-state networks. Each of a plurality of multiword expressions is encoded into a regular expression. Each regular expression encodes a base form common to a plurality of derivative forms defined by ones of the multiword expressions. Each of the plurality of regular expressions is compiled with factorization into a set of finite-state networks. A union of the finite-state networks in the set of finite-state networks is performed to define a multiword finite-state network and a set of subnets. The multiword finite-state network and the set of subnets are traversed to identify a path corresponding to one of the plurality of multiword expressions, wherein only transitions

originating from the multiword finite-state network are accounted for to ascertain a path number identifying a base form of the one of the plurality of multiword expressions.

[0005] However, Privault simply does not address at least the features directed to “[u]sing a computer, establishing a predetermined set of regular expressions, each regular expression of said predetermined set of regular expressions corresponding to a specific parts-of-speech (POS) tag sequence...” as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claims 10 and 33. Instead Privault describes encoding a multi-word expression into a regular expression. (See for example, Privault, Title, Abstract, ll. 1, para 10, ll. 4-5, para 47 etc.) Thus, Privault fails to address at least this feature of the claims.

[0006] Moreover, since Privault fails to disclose the requisite “[s]et of regular expressions... corresponding to a specific parts-of-speech (POS) tag sequence...” it cannot disclose “[matching said predetermined set of regular expressions to said plurality of POS tag sequences...” as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claims 10 and 33. Thus, claims 1, 10 and 33 define patentable subject matter over Privault. Claims 41 and 42 depend from claims 1 and 10 and therefore define patentable subject matter for at least the same reasons.

[0007] Claims 2-3, 6-9, 12-13, 16-19, 29-30, 34-35, and 37-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Privault, in view of Subasic, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,721,734), hereinafter referred to as Subasic. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

[0008] However, Subasic merely describes a technique for analyzing affect in which ambiguity in both emotion and natural language is explicitly represented and processed through fuzzy logic. In particular, textual information is processed to i) isolate a vocabulary of words belonging to an emotion, ii) represent the meaning of each word belonging to that emotion using multiple categories and scalar metrics, iii) compute profiles for text documents based on the categories and scores of their component words, and iv) manipulate the profiles to visualize the texts. The representation vehicle in the system is a set of fuzzy semantic categories (affect categories) followed by their respective centralities (degrees of relatedness between lexicon entries and their various categories) and intensities (representative of the strength of the affect level described by that word) called an affect set. A graphical representation of the affect set can also be used as a tool for decision making.

[0009] The Communication admits that Privault fails to disclose the subject matter of dependent claims 2-3, 6-9, 12-13, 16-19, 29-30, 34-35 and 37-40. (6/2/2009 Communication, p. 5, ll. 15-17). Applicants agree.

[0010] The 6/2/2009 Communication attempts to remedy these deficiencies of Privault with Subasic. The 6/2/2009 Communication does not assert that Subasic remedies the above-identified deficiencies of Privault, nor does it. Thus independent claims 1, 10 and 33 define patentable subject matter over Privault-Subasic. Claims 2-3, 6-9, 12-13, 16-19, 29-30, 34-35 and 37-40 depend from claims 1, 10 and 33 and therefore define patentable subject matter for at least the same reasons.

[0011] Claims 31-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Privault, in view of Subasic, in view of Chase (U.S. Patent No. 6,332,143). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

[0012] Chase merely describes a computerized interactive language reference system includes a database of terms with associated denotative, connotative and human interest information. The system goes through each word of a passage and determines whether there is an entry in the database for such word. For each term where there is an entry, there is a check to see if the term has more than one denotative meaning. Where there is more than one denotative meaning, an appropriate one of the denotative meanings is selected. The system evaluates the passage for positive emotional connotations, negative emotional connotations, global emotional connotations, human interest, connotations of power, connotations of activity and connotations of abstractness/concreteness. Dominant emotional connotations and dominant words also are specifically identified and ranked.

[0013] The 6/2/2009 Communication does not assert that Chase remedies the above-identified deficiencies of Privault-Subasic nor does it. Thus, independent claims 1, 10 and 33 define patentable subject matter over Privault-Subasic and Chase. Claims 31-32 depend from claims 1 and 10 and therefore define patentable subject matter for at least the same reasons.

[0014] The claimed invention, as provided in amended independent claims 1, 10 and 33 contain features, which are patentably distinguishable from the prior art references of record.

[0015] Moreover, the Applicants note that all claims are properly supported in the specification and accompanying drawings, and no new matter is being added. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

III. Formal Matters and Conclusion

[0016] With respect to the rejections to the claims, the claims have been amended, above, to overcome these rejections. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections to the claims.

[0017] In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-13, 16-19, 29-35, and 37-42, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

[0018] Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary. Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Attorney's Deposit Account Number 09-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 20, 2009

/Christian Austin-Hollands/
Christian Austin-Hollands, Esq.
Registration No. 46,527

Gibb I.P. Law Firm, LLC
2568-A Riva Road, Suite 304
Annapolis, MD 21401
Voice: (410) 573-1545
Fax: (301) 261-8825
Customer Number: 29154